

REGIONAL REVIEW NOTIFICATION

Atlanta Regional Commission • 229 Peachtree Street NE | Suite 100 | Atlanta, Georgia 30303 • ph: 404.463.3100 fax: 404.463.3205 • atlantaregional.org

DATE: Nov. 23, 2020

ARC REVIEW CODE: R2011231

TO:	Mayor Mitch Colvin
ATTN TO:	David Rast, Director of Community Development
FROM:	Douglas R. Hooker, Executive Director
RE:	Development of Regional Impact Review

aghe R. Hok

Digital signature Original on file

The Atlanta Regional Commission (ARC) has completed a preliminary regional review of the following Development of Regional Impact (DRI). ARC reviewed the DRI with regard to its relationship to regional plans, goals and policies – and impacts it may have on the activities, plans, goals and policies of other local jurisdictions as well as state, federal and other agencies. This preliminary report does not address whether the DRI is or is not in the best interest of the local government.

Name of Proposal:Southeast Data Center Campus DRI #3160Review Type:DRIDate Opened:Nov. 23 2020Deadline for Comments:Dec. 8, 2020Det Deadline for Comments:Dec. 8, 2020

Description: A Development of Regional Impact (DRI) review of a proposed 1,015,000-square-foot data center and technology business park on 123 acres in the City of Fayetteville at the intersection of (Floy Farr Parkway (SR 54) and Veterans Parkway. The local trigger is a site plan review. Half buildout is proposed by 2027, full buildout by 2031.

PRELIMINARY COMMENTS: According to the ARC Unified Growth Policy Map (UGPM), part of The Atlanta Region's Plan, this DRI is in the Developing Suburbs Area of the region. ARC's Regional Development Guide (RDG) details recommended policies for areas on the UGPM. General RDG information and recommendations for Developing Suburbs are listed at the bottom of these comments. The site is also directly adjacent to a Regional Attractor: Wellness District for Piedmont Fayette Hospital (the City's largest employer) and other related medical uses nearby. It's also located south of the Community Activity Center for Trilith Studios.

This data center project is a unique use in that it occupies a large area but will generate few trips once operational. The City of Fayetteville has identified Data Centers as one of its targeted industries for economic development, along with Corporate Headquarters, Film/Television/Digital Media, Film Industry Vendors, and Technology Firms. The DRI is situated to take advantage of its location next to an electrical substation. While this is likely to remain a data center, the site plan's grid carries the potential for being adapted to other industrial and office uses in the future. It also anticipates potential street connections to surrounding properties, which is beneficial for long-term circulation.

The intensity of this DRI generally aligns with the RDG's recommended range of densities and building heights in Developing Suburbs. It should be noted that many areas around this site are predominated by low to medium density, single family residential uses and undeveloped land. This includes land outside the City of Fayetteville, e.g., in unincorporated Fayette County, which abuts the site on several sides.

The Future Land Use Map in the City's 2017 comprehensive plan identifies this area as Business Park, which carries the following recommendations: " ... site design will have a character similar to that of a college campus with significant greenspace and pleasant pedestrian connections between buildings." Along those lines, care should be taken to ensure that the development promotes a functional, safe, clearly marked and comfortable pedestrian experience on all streets, paths and parking areas on the site. Additional comments from ARC's Transportation Access & Mobility Group are attached.

The project can further support The Atlanta Region's Plan in general by incorporating other aspects of regional policy, including green infrastructure and/or low-impact design (e.g., rain gardens, vegetated swales, etc.) in parking areas and site driveways, and as part of any improvements to site frontages. Please see the attached comments, which detail several conditions that must be considered because of the project's location with the Whitewater Creek Water Supply Watershed for both the City and the County.

Further to the above, Developing Suburbs are areas that have developed from roughly 1995 to today and are projected to remain suburbs through 2040. General policy recommendations for Developing Suburbs include:

- New development should connect to the existing road network and adjacent developments and use of cul-de-sacs or other means resulting in disconnected subdivisions should be discouraged
- Maximize the usefulness of existing recreational facilities in addition to providing new recreational opportunities
- Eliminate vacant or under-utilized parking areas through mechanisms such as out-parceling or conversion to community open space
- Use rain gardens, vegetated swales or other enhanced water filtration design to enhance the quality of stormwater run-off- Identify other opportunities to foster a sense of community by developing town centers, village centers or other places of centralized location

THE FOLLOWING LOCAL GOVERNMENTS AND AGENCIES RECEIVED NOTICE OF THIS REVIEW:

ARC COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT ARC RESEARCH & ANALYTICS GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES FAYETTE COUNTY ARC TRANSPORTATION ACCESS & MOBILITY ARC AGING & HEALTH RESOURCES GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION CITY OF PEACHTREE CITY ARC NATURAL RESOURCES GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY AFFAIRS GRTA/SRTA TOWN OF TYRONE

If you have any questions regarding this review, please contact Greg Giuffrida at (470) 378–1531 or <u>ggiuffrida@atlantaregional.org</u>. This finding will be published to the ARC review website located at <u>http://atlantaregional.org/plan-reviews</u>.



Individual Completing Form:

DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL IMPACT REQUEST FOR COMMENTS

Instructions: The project described below has been submitted to this Regional Commission for review as a Development of Regional Impact (DRI). A DRI is a development of sufficient scale or importance that it is likely to generate impacts beyond the jurisdiction in which the project is located, for example in adjoining cities or neighboring counties. We would like to consider your comments on this proposed development in our DRI review process. Therefore, please review the information about the project included in this packet and offer your comments in the space provided. The completed form should be returned to ARC on or before the specified return deadline.

Preliminary Findings of the RDC: Southeast Data Center Campus DRI #3160 See the Preliminary Report.

Comments from affected party (attach additional sheets as needed):

Local Government:	<i>Comments must be emailed to:</i> Greg Giuffrida
Department:	Atlanta Regional Commission Ph. (470) 378-1531 ggiuffrida@atlantaregional.org
Telephone: ()	Return Date: Dec. 8, 2020
Signature:	
Date:	

ARC STAFF NOTICE OF REGIONAL REVIEW AND COMMENT FORM

DATE: Nov. 23, 2020

ARC REVIEW CODE: R2011231

TO: ARC Group Managers **FROM:** Greg Giuffrida, 470-378-1531

Reviewing staff by Jurisdiction: Community Development: Giuffrida, Greg Transportation Access and Mobility: Little, Aries Natural Resources: Santo, Jim Research and Analytics: Skinner, Jim Aging and Health Resources: Perumbeti, Katie Name of Proposal: Southeast Data Center Campus DRI #3160 Review Type: Development of Regional Impact Description: Description: A Development of Regional Impact (DRI) review of a proposed 1,015,000-square-foot data center and technology business park on 123 acres in the City of Fayetteville at the intersection of (Floy Farr Parkway (SR 54) and Veterans Parkway. The local trigger is a rezoning. Half buildout is proposed by 2027, full buildout by 2031. Submitting Local Government: City of Fayetteville Development: Development: Diverse of Proposed by 2027, full buildout by 2031.

Date Opened: Nov. 23, 2020

Deadline for Comments: Dec. 8, 2020

Date to Close: Dec. 10 2020

Response:

- 2) □ While neither specifically consistent nor inconsistent, the proposal relates to the following regional development guide listed in the comment section.

COMMENTS:



requested of the loca government for this projec	Sewer :Vater Permit ⊘Other conceptual site plan approval	
Is this project a phase or pa of a larger overall project	t _(not selected)⊡Yes⊪No	
If yes, what percent of th overall project does thi project/phase represent		
Estimated Project Completion Dates	t This project/phase: 2022 : Overall project: 2030	
Back to Top		

GRTA DRI Page | ARC DRI Page | RC Links | DCA DRI Page

DRI Site Map | Contact



Is a water line extension required to serve this (not selected) Yes®No project?		
If yes, how much additional line (in miles) will be required?		
	Wastewater Disposal	
Name of wastewater treatment provider for this site:	City of Faytteville	
What is the estimated sewage flow to be generated by the project, measured in Millions of Gallons Per Day (MGD)?	0.0175	
Is sufficient wastewater treatment capacity available to serve this proposed project?	(not selected) Yes No	
If no, describe any plans to e	xpand existing wastewater treatment capacity:	
Is a sewer line extension required to serve this project?	ິ(not selected) [®] YesີNo	
If yes, how much additional I	ine (in miles) will be required?1.5 miles	
	Land Transportation	
How much traffic volume is		
expected to be generated by the proposed development, in peak hour vehicle trips per day? (If only an alternative measure of volume is available, please provide.)	1,005 ADT	
Has a traffic study been		
whether or not transportation or access improvements will be needed to serve this project?	ି(not selected)≋ YesିNo	
Are transportation improvements needed to serve this project?	ି(not selected)ିYes⊛No	
If yes, please describe below	r Traffic study underway. No transportation improvements identified to date.	
	Solid Waste Disposal	
How much solid waste is the project expected to generate annually (in tons)?	1,000,000	
Is sufficient landfill capacity available to serve this proposed project?	ິ (not selected)◎ YesີNo	
If no, describe any plans to e	expand existing landfill capacity:	
Will only bezerdeus wests		
be generated by the development?	ິ(not selected)∵Yes≋No	
If yes, please explain:		
Stormwater Management		
What percentage of the site		
is projected to be impervious surface once the proposed development has been constructed?	35%	
Describe any measures prop project's impacts on stormwa standards that pertain to buff	osed (such as buffers, detention or retention ponds, pervious parking areas) to mitigate the ter management: The development will meet all local, state and federal regulations and ers, stormwater quality and quantity management	
Environmental Quality		
Is the development located v	vithin, or likely to affect any of the following:	
1. Water supply watersheds?	ິ(not selected)ິYes◎No	
2. Significant groundwater	◯(not selected)◯Yes No	
recharge areas?		

If no, describe any plans to expand the existing water supply capacity:

2 Matlanda2		
3. Wetlands?	(not selected) Tes No	
4. Protected mountains?	C(not selected) Yes ®No	
5. Protected river corridors?	◯(not selected)ິYes®No	
6. Floodplains?	ິ(not selected)◎ Yes No	
7. Historic resources?	ິ(not selected)ິYes®No	
8. Other environmentally sensitive resources?	⊂(not selected)∋Yes®No	
If you answered yes to any question above, describe how the identified resource(s) may be affected: wetland and floodplain areas ill not be impacted or disturbed pre-or post construction		
Back to Top		

GRTA DRI Page | ARC DRI Page | RC Links | DCA DRI Page

DRI Site Map | Contact

SOUTHEASTERN DATA CENTER DRI City of Fayetteville Natural Resources Group Review Comments

November 20, 2020

While ARC and the Metropolitan North Georgia Water Planning District have no regulatory or review authority over this project, the Natural Resources Group has identified City and State regulations that could apply to this property. Other regulations may also apply that we have not identified.

Water Supply Watershed and Stream Buffer Protection

The proposed project property is located entirely within the Whitewater Creek Water Supply Watershed which is a public water supply source for both the City of Fayetteville and Fayette County, and which is classified as a small (less than 100 square mile) water supply watershed. Based on the "Fayette County Water System Whitewater Creek & Horton Creek & City of Fayetteville Water Department Whitewater Creek Water Supply Watersheds" map in the March 2020 <u>Source Water Assessment Plan</u> for Metro Atlanta prepared by the Metropolitan North Georgia Water Planning District, approximately 1/3 of the site, at the southern end of the property, is only within the County portion of the watershed. The remainder of the proposed project property is in both the City and County portions of the watershed.

Under the Georgia Planning Act of 1989, all development in a small public water supply watershed is subject to the DNR Part 5 Water Supply Watershed Minimum Criteria (Chapter 391-3-16-.01, Criteria for Water Supply Watersheds) unless alternative criteria are developed and adopted by the jurisdiction according to the requirements of the Part 5 criteria and are then approved by Georgia EPD. The criteria include a 100-foot vegetative buffer and 150-foot impervious setback along all perennial streams within 7 miles upstream of a public water supply intake. Above the 7 miles, the minimum criteria halve the buffer and setback to 50 and 75 feet, respectively. The City of Fayetteville has adopted a water supply watershed protection ordinance which requires a 100-foot vegetative buffer and 150-foot impervious surface setback on all perennial streams in a water supply watershed with no differentiation based on distance from an intake. Perennial streams are defined in the City ordinance as streams that are shown as perennial on a USGS quad sheet. The USGS coverage for the area shows a blue line (perennial) stream running along the northern and northwestern portions of the property, ending in a pond. Both the stream and the pond are shown on the site plan.

The submitted site plan also shows a 100-foot undisturbed buffer and 150-foot impervious setback along the unnamed creek, as far as the pond. The site plan also shows two short streams, not shown on the USGS coverage, flowing into the pond. A 50-foot undisturbed buffer and a 75-foot impervious surface setback are shown on both these streams, which would be consistent with the requirements of the City's Stream Buffer Ordinance.

Any unmapped streams on the property may also be subject to the City's Stream Buffer Ordinance. All streams as well as any other waters of the state on this property are also subject to the State 25-foot Sediment and Erosion Control Buffer. Natural Resources Group Comments Southeastern Data Center DRI November 20, 2020 Page Two

Storm Water/Water Quality

During the planning phase, the stormwater management system (system) should meet the requirements of the local jurisdiction's post-construction (or post-development) stormwater management ordinance. The system should be designed to prevent increased flood damage, streambank channel erosion, habitat degradation and water quality degradation, and enhance and promote the public health, safety and general welfare. The system design should also be in accordance with the applicable sections of the Georgia Stormwater Management Manual (<u>www.georgiastormwater.com</u>) such as design standards, calculations, formulas, and methods. Where possible, the project should use stormwater better site design practices included in the Georgia Stormwater Management Manual, Volume 2, Section 2.3.

During construction, the project should conform to the relevant state and federal erosion and sedimentation control requirements.



regional impact + local relevance

Development of Regional Impact Assessment of Consistency with the Regional Transportation Plan

DRI INFORMATION

DRI Number	#3160		
DRI Title	Southeastern Data Center		
County	Fayette County		
City (if applicable)	Fayetteville		
Address / Location	SR 54 at Veterans Parkway and Tyrone Road		
Proposed Developmer	nt Type: Development of a 1,015,000 square feet data center storage buildings Build Out : 2027		
Review Process	EXPEDITED NON-EXPEDITED		
REVIEW INFORMATION			
Prepared by	ARC Transportation Access and Mobility Division		

- Staff LeadAries LittleCopiedMarquitrice Mangham
- DateNovember 20, 2020

TRAFFIC STUDY

Prepared byThomas & Hutton Engineering CompanyDateNovember 20, 2020

REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN PROJECTS

01. Did the traffic analysis incorporate all projects contained in the current version of the fiscally constrained RTP which are within the study area or along major transportation corridors connecting the study area with adjacent jurisdictions?

YES (provide the regional plan referenced and the page number of the traffic study where relevant projects are identified)

Click here to provide comments.

NO (provide comments below)

The Fayetteville Multi-Use Bridge and Paths (FA-353) was identified in the RTP and not referenced within the traffic analysis. This project is located between Veterans Pkwy and Piedmont Fayette Hospital.

REGIONAL NETWORKS

02. Will the development site be directly served by any roadways identified as Regional Thoroughfares?

A Regional Thoroughfare is a major transportation corridor that serves multiple ways of traveling, including walking, bicycling, driving, and riding transit. It connects people and goods to important places in metropolitan Atlanta. A Regional Thoroughfare's operations should be managed through application of special traffic control strategies and suitable land development guidelines in order to maintain travel efficiency, reliability, and safety for all users. In light of the special function that Regional Thoroughfares serve in supporting cross-regional and interjurisdictional mobility and access, the network receives priority consideration for infrastructure investment in the Metro Atlanta region. Any access points between the development and a Regional Thoroughfare, combined with the development's on-site circulation patterns, must be designed with the goal of preserving the highest possible level of capacity and safety for all users of the roadway.

ר ∣

 \times YES (identify the roadways and existing/proposed access points)

The proposed project site has 2 access points which one of the driveways is located on SR 54.

03. Will the development site be directly served by any roadways identified as Regional Truck Routes?

A Regional Truck Route is a freeway, state route or other roadway which serves as a critical link for the movement of goods to, from and within the Region by connecting airports, intermodal/multimodal facilities, distribution and warehousing centers and manufacturing clusters with the rest of the state and nation. These facilities often serve a key mobility and access function for other users as well, including drivers, bicyclists, pedestrians and transit users. A Regional Truck Route's operations should be managed through application of special traffic control strategies and suitable land development guidelines in order to maintain travel efficiency, reliability, and safety for all users. In light of the special function that Regional Truck Routes serve in supporting cross-regional and interjurisdictional mobility and access, the network receives priority consideration for infrastructure investment in the Metro Atlanta region. Any access points between the development and a Regional Truck Route, combined with the development's on-site circulation patterns, must be designed with the goal of preserving the highest possible level of capacity and safety for all users of the roadway.

NO

YES (identify the roadways and existing/proposed access points)

SR 54 is designated as a Regional Truck Route.

04. If the development site is within one mile of an existing rail service, provide information on accessibility conditions.

Access between major developments and transit services provide options for people who cannot or prefer not to drive, expand economic opportunities by better connecting people and jobs, and can help reduce congestion. If a transit service is available nearby, but walking or bicycling between the development site and the nearest station is a challenge, the applicable local government(s) is encouraged to make the route a funding priority for future walking and bicycling infrastructure improvements.

NOT APPLICABLE (nearest station more than one mile away)

Operator / Rail Line

, ,	
Nearest Station	Click here to enter name of operator and rail line
Distance*	Within or adjacent to the development site (0.10 mile or less)
	0.10 to 0.50 mile
	0.50 to 1.00 mile
Walking Access*	Sidewalks and crosswalks provide sufficient connectivity
	Sidewalk and crosswalk network is incomplete
	Not applicable (accessing the site by walking is not consistent with the type of development proposed)
	Click here to provide comments.

Bicycling Access*	Dedicated paths, lanes or cycle tracks provide sufficient connectivity
	Low volume and/or low speed streets provide connectivity
	Route follows high volume and/or high speed streets
	Not applicable (accessing the site by bicycling is not consistent with the type of development proposed)
Transit Connectivity	Fixed route transit agency bus service available to rail station
	Private shuttle or circulator available to rail station
	No services available to rail station
	Not applicable (accessing the site by transit is not consistent with the type of development proposed)
	Click here to provide comments.

* Following the most direct feasible walking or bicycling route to the nearest point on the development site

05. If there is currently no rail transit service within one mile of the development site, is nearby rail service planned in the fiscally constrained RTP?

Access between major developments and transit services provide options for people who cannot or prefer not to drive, expand economic opportunities by better connecting people and jobs, and can help reduce traffic congestion. If a transit agency operates within the jurisdiction and expansion plans are being considered in the general vicinity of the development site, the agency should give consideration to how the site can be best served during the evaluation of alignments and station locations. Proactive negotiations with the development team and local government(s) are encouraged to determine whether right-of-way within the site should be identified and protected for potential future service. If direct service to the site is not feasible or cost effective, the transit agency and local government(s) are encouraged to ensure good walking and bicycling access accessibility is provided between the development and the future rail line. These improvements should be considered fundamental components of the overall transit expansion project, with improvements completed concurrent with or prior to the transit service being brought online.

- NOT APPLICABLE (rail service already exists)
 - NOT APPLICABLE (accessing the site by transit is not consistent with the type of development proposed)
 - NO (no plans exist to provide rail service in the general vicinity)
 - YES (provide additional information on the timeframe of the expansion project below)
 - CST planned within TIP period
 - CST planned within first portion of long range period
 - CST planned near end of plan horizon

Click here to provide comments.

06. If the development site is within one mile of fixed route bus services (including any privately operated shuttles or circulators open to the general public), provide information on walking and bicycling accessibility conditions.

Access between major developments and transit services provide options for people who cannot or prefer not to drive, expand economic opportunities by better connecting people and jobs, and can help reduce congestion. If a transit service is available nearby, but walking or bicycling between the development site and the nearest station is a challenge, the applicable local government(s) is encouraged to make the connection a funding priority for future walking and bicycling infrastructure improvements.			
\triangleleft	NOT APPLICABLE (neare	st bus, shuttle or circulator stop more than one mile away)	
	SERVICE WITHIN ONE M	ILE (provide additional information below)	
	Operator(s)	Click here to enter name of operator(s).	
	Bus Route(s)	Click here to enter bus route number(s).	
	Distance*	Within or adjacent to the development site (0.10 mile or less)	
		0.10 to 0.50 mile	
		0.50 to 1.00 mile	
	Walking Access*	Sidewalks and crosswalks provide sufficient connectivity	
		Sidewalk and crosswalk network is incomplete	
		Not applicable (accessing the site by walking is not consistent with the type of development proposed)	
		Click here to provide comments.	
	Bicycling Access*	Dedicated paths, lanes or cycle tracks provide sufficient connectivity	
		Low volume and/or low speed streets provide sufficient connectivity	
		Route uses high volume and/or high speed streets	
		Not applicable (accessing the site by bicycling is not consistent with the type of development proposed)	

* Following the most direct feasible walking or bicycling route to the nearest point on the development site

07. Does a transit agency which provides rail and/or fixed route bus service operate anywhere within the jurisdiction in which the development site is located?

Access between major developments and transit services provide options for people who cannot or prefer not to drive, expand economic opportunities by better connecting people and jobs, and can help reduce traffic congestion. If a transit agency operates within the jurisdiction and a comprehensive operations plan update is undertaken, the agency should give consideration to serving the site during the evaluation of future routes, bus stops and transfer facilities. If the nature of the development is amenable to access by transit, walking or bicycling, but direct service to the site is not feasible or cost effective, the transit agency and local government(s) should ensure good walking and bicycling access accessibility is provided between the development and any routes within a one mile radius. The applicable local government(s) is encouraged to make these connections a funding priority for future walking and bicycling infrastructure improvements.

NO 🛛

YES

08. If the development site is within one mile of an existing multi-use path or trail, provide information on accessibility conditions.

Access between major developments and walking/bicycling facilities provide options for people who cannot or prefer not to drive, expand economic opportunities by better connecting people and jobs, and can help reduce traffic congestion. If connectivity with a regionally significant path or trail is available nearby, but walking or bicycling between the development site and those facilities is a challenge, the applicable local government(s) is encouraged to make the route a funding priority for future walking and bicycling infrastructure improvements.

] NOT APPLICABLE (nearest path or trail more than one mile away)

YES (provide additional information below)

Name of facility Fayetteville Multi-Use Bridge and Paths (FA-353) which construction is programmed in FY21.

Distance	Within or adjacent to development site (0.10 mile or less)
	🔀 0.15 to 0.50 mile
	0.50 to 1.00 mile
Walking Access*	Sidewalks and crosswalks provide connectivity
	Sidewalk and crosswalk network is incomplete
	Not applicable (accessing the site by walking is not consistent with the type of development proposed)
Bicycling Access*	Dedicated lanes or cycle tracks provide connectivity
	Low volume and/or low speed streets provide connectivity

Route uses high volume and/or high speed streets

 \bowtie Not applicable (accessing the site by bicycling is not consistent with the type of development proposed

Following the most direct feasible walking or bicycling route to the nearest point on the development site

OTHER TRANSPORTATION DESIGN CONSIDERATIONS

09. Does the site plan provide for the construction of publicly accessible local road or drive aisle connections with adjacent parcels?

The ability for drivers and bus routes to move between developments without using the adjacent arterial or collector roadway networks can save time and reduce congestion. Such opportunities should be considered and proactively incorporated into development site plans whenever possible.

- YES (connections to adjacent parcels are planned as part of the development)
- YES (stub outs will make future connections possible when adjacent parcels redevelop)
- NO (the site plan precludes future connections with adjacent parcels when they redevelop)
- OTHER (Please explain)

Per the site plan, there will be access provided to the Fayette County Board of Education parcel.

10. Does the site plan enable pedestrians and bicyclists to move between destinations within the development site safely and conveniently?

The ability for walkers and bicyclists to move within the site safely and conveniently reduces reliance on vehicular trips, which has congestion reduction and health benefits. Development site plans should incorporate well designed and direct sidewalk connections between all key destinations. To the extent practical, bicycle lanes or multiuse paths are encouraged for large acreage sites and where high volumes of bicyclists and pedestrians are possible.

- YES (sidewalks provided on all key walking routes and both sides of roads whenever practical and bicyclists should have no major issues navigating the street network)
- PARTIAL (some walking and bicycling facilities are provided, but connections are not comprehensive and/or direct)
- NO (walking and bicycling facilities within the site are limited or nonexistent)
- $\left|\right\rangle$ NOT APPLICABLE (the nature of the development does not lend itself to internal walking and bicycling trips)
- OTHER (Please explain)

Click here to provide comments.

11. Does the site plan provide the ability to construct publicly accessible bicycling and walking connections with adjacent parcels which may be redeveloped in the future?

The ability for walkers and bicyclists to move between developments safely and conveniently reduces reliance on vehicular trips, which has congestion reduction and health benefits. Such opportunities should be considered and proactively incorporated into development site plans whenever possible.

- YES (connections to adjacent parcels are planned as part of the development)
- YES (stub outs will make future connections possible when adjacent parcels redevelop)
 - NO (the development site plan does not enable walking or bicycling to/from adjacent parcels)
 - NO (the site plan precludes future connections with adjacent parcels when they redevelop)
- NOT APPLICABLE (adjacent parcels are not likely to develop or redevelop in the near future)
- NOT APPLICABLE (the nature of the development or adjacent parcels does not lend itself to interparcel walking and bicycling trips)
- 12. Does the site plan effectively manage truck movements and separate them, to the extent possible, from the flow of pedestrians, bicyclists and motorists both within the site and on the surrounding road network?

The ability for delivery and service vehicles to efficiently enter and exit major developments is often key to their economic success. So is the ability of visitors and customers being able to move around safely and pleasantly within the site. To the extent practical, truck movements should be segregated by minimizing the number of conflict points with publicly accessible internal roadways, sidewalks, paths and other facilities.

- YES (truck routes to serve destinations within the site are clearly delineated, provide ample space for queuing and turning around, and are separated from other users to the extent practical)
- PARTIAL (while one or more truck routes are also used by motorists and/or interface with primary walking and bicycling routes, the site plan mitigates the potential for conflict adequately)
- NO (one or more truck routes serving the site conflict directly with routes likely to be used heavily by pedestrians, bicyclists and/or motorists)
- NOT APPLICABLE (the nature of the development will not generate a wide variety of users and/or very low truck volumes, so the potential for conflict is negligible)

RECOMMENDATIONS

13. Do the transportation network recommendations outlined in the traffic study appear to be feasible from a constructability standpoint?

UNKNOWN (additional study is necessary)

YES (based on information made available through the review process; does not represent a thorough engineering / financial analysis)

NO (see comments below)

Click here to enter text.

- 14. Is ARC aware of any issues with the development proposal which may result in it being opposed by one or more local governments, agencies or stakeholder groups?
 - NO (based on information shared with ARC staff prior to or during the review process; does not reflect the outcome of an extensive stakeholder engagement process)

YES (see comments below)

Click here to enter text.

15. ARC offers the following additional comments for consideration by the development team and/or the applicable local government(s):

None

